



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,923	04/30/2001	Sergey Brin	0026-0002	9916

44989 7590 02/07/2007
HARRITY SNYDER, LLP
11350 Random Hills Road
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,923

Applicant(s)

BRIN, SERGEY

Examiner

Benjamin A. Ailes

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to correspondence filed 22 November 2006. New ground(s) of rejection have been set forth and therefore this rejection is NON-FINAL.
2. Claims 18-41 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 22 November 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim 18

4. Applicant argues that neither Wolff nor Yahoo taken alone or in any reasonable combination discloses or suggests the combination of features in claim 18 and that Wolff and Yahoo do not disclose or suggest associating one or more search terms with the special event logo, the one or more search terms relating to the special event. The examiner respectfully disagrees in view of the reasons set forth in the rejection below and in response to arguments presented by applicant outlined below. Applicant argues on page 10 of the REMARKS that "nowhere does Wolff disclose or suggest a special event logo (created by modifying a standard company logo for a special event) and, therefore, cannot disclose or suggest associated one or more search terms with the special event logo, the one or more search terms relating to the special event, as required by claim 18." Taking broadest reasonable interpretation of what is claimed, it is best understood in the broadest sense that the "standard company logo" and the "special event logo" in the field of the invention are images that are displayed on a web page that are viewable by a user using a web browser program. The image can have a

search term associated with it and the image can be "clickable" wherein when a user "clicks" on the image a search is invoked utilizing the search term. In view of the rejection, Wolff is relied upon for teaching this in the art wherein Wolff teaches the displaying of an image to a user (fig. 2, part 102, banner icon), the association of a search term associated with the icon and based on what the icon represents through imaging (col. 8, ll. 43-46, unique indicia) and the invocation of a search related to the search term (col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 7, invoking a search based on a selection of the icon by a user utilizing the unique indicia). Wolff is not relied upon for teaching in the art the image being a company logo that is altered to become a special event logo. The image being a company logo is deemed an obvious variation in the art. It is deemed well known in the art that company logos can be displayed as images on web pages (for example, Yahoo!). It is also deemed well known in the art that a company would want to alter their own logo to commemorate a special event (for example, Yahoo! altering their logo to commemorate the Christmas holiday season on December 23, 1996). Applicant argued further on page 11 of REMARKS that Yahoo! does not disclose or remotely suggest "associating one or more search terms with the special event logo where the one or more search terms relate to the special event. Examiner did not rely on Yahoo! for teaching this aspect of applicant's invention. Yahoo! is merely relied upon for teaching the display of a special event company logo being displayed on a web page and viewable by a user using a web browser program. Wolff is relied upon for the use of a search term that is associated with an image that can be displayed on a web page as outline above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in

view of the combination that the search term would always relate to what is being displayed by the image to the user because it would not make reasonable sense to one of ordinary skill for the search term to be totally unrelated to what the image represents and therefore the obvious variant of imaging use wherein the image could be a special event company logo as taught by Yahoo! the search term associated with the special event company logo would be related to the topic of what the special event company logo image is portraying to a user through graphical means. Examiner maintains that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Wolff, particularly the ability to display images to users that are clickable, and Yahoo!, particularly teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event because the use of different types of images is deemed an obvious variation. In view of Wolff the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28). For at least these reasons, claim 18 as written is not deemed patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 20

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim 26

6. Applicant argues with respect to claim 26 that Wolff and Yahoo! do not disclose or suggest "instructions for associating a link or search results with a special event logo created by modifying a standard company logo for a special event, the link identifying a

document relating to the special event, and the search results relating to the special event.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Based on what is required by the claim, only “a link” or “search results” in the prior art would meet the scope of the claim. Wolff teaches the association of a search term associated with the icon and based on what the icon represents through imaging (col. 8, ll. 43-46, unique indicia) and the invocation of a search related to the search term (col. 8, line 65 – col. 9, line 7, invoking a search based on a selection of the icon by a user utilizing the unique indicia) and returning the results to the requesting user (Wolff, column 9, lines 9-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the combination that the search term would always relate to what is being displayed by the image to the user because it would not make reasonable sense to one of ordinary skill for the search term to be totally unrelated to what the image represents and therefore the obvious variant of imaging use wherein the image could be a special event company logo as taught by Yahoo! the search term associated with the special event company logo would be related to the topic of what the special event company logo image is portraying to a user through graphical means. For at least these reasons, claim 26 as written is not deemed patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 27

7. With respect to claim 27, applicant argues that claim 27 is patentable over Wolff and Yahoo!, for similar reasons with regard to claim 18. Further, applicant argues that Wolff and Yahoo! do not disclose or suggest a processor configured to determine a home page for a web page on a network or identify a standard company logo on the

Art Unit: 2142

home page. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant in view of what is taught by Wolff and Yahoo!. Wolff teaches the use of computer processors for example in figure 1, item 14 and Yahoo! teaches the inherent use of a computer processor by way of having an image uploaded to a web site wherein the uploading of an image would not be possible in any way without the use of a computer processor. Yahoo! clearly teaches the uploading of an image to a web page in this case the uploading has been done to the home page as indicated (www.yahoo.com) and the altered image is actually being displayed where the standard company logo is customarily presented. By way of actually uploading the image to the home page by Yahoo! then it is taught by Yahoo! the functionality of home page determination. Therefore claim 27 is not deemed patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 28

8. With respect to claim 28, applicant argues that claim 28 is patentable over Wolff and Yahoo!, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 18. Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 18.

Claim 37

9. With respect to claim 37, applicant argues that claim 37 is patentable over Wolff and Yahoo!, for similar reasons given with regard to claim 18. Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 18. Applicant argues further that Wolff and Yahoo! do not disclose or suggest invoking a search for web pages relating to the special event in response to a received selection of a special

Art Unit: 2142

event logo. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the combination that the search term would always relate to what is being displayed by the image to the user because it would not make reasonable sense to one of ordinary skill for the search term to be totally unrelated to what the image represents and therefore the obvious variant of imaging use wherein the image could be a special event company logo as taught by Yahoo! the search term associated with the special event company logo would be related to the topic of what the special event company logo image is portraying to a user through graphical means. Wolff teaches in column 9, lines 3-13 the searching of on-line product/service databases and returning the results to the user. It is deemed that the online content being sought after by Wolff falls within the scope of the web pages being claimed and therefore the search and retrieval system taught by Wolff meets the scope of the claim. Therefore claim 37 is not deemed patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 18, 19, 21-28, 29, 31-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff (US 6,247,047 B1) in view of Yahoo! (Yahoo!, <http://www.archive.org/web/19961223150621/http://www8.yahoo.com/>).

12. Regarding claim 18, Wolff teaches a method for enticing users to access a web page comprising the use of a graphical icon image (i.e. an advertisement banner) wherein the icon image is uploaded for display to a user on a web page. A keyword (search term) (indicia) is associated with the icon image wherein when the user selects the icon image a search is invoked to search an online database and then the search results are presented to the user on a web page (see Wolff, column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 15). Wolff does not explicitly teach that the graphical icon image is a standard company logo that can be modified to become a special event logo. However, in related art, Yahoo! teaches wherein a company logo can be modified to commemorate a special event (see Yahoo!). Wolff provides an environment wherein different icon images can be displayed to a user on a web page and therefore it is deemed an obvious variation to present to a user an altered image. Yahoo! demonstrates this functionality wherein Yahoo! has altered their own company logo to celebrate the Christmas season. Wolff teaches that is known in the prior art to use different types of images for seasonal and one time use (column 2, ll. 27-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the teachings of Wolff wherein the ability to display clickable images to a user on a web page in combination with the functionalities of Yahoo! wherein it is taught that one of ordinary skill can alter an image and upload it for display to a user on a web page. Further, it would have been obvious to associate the "search term" to relate to the graphical icon image as taught by Wolff because the keyword associated with the icon image is supposed to directly identify the product or service being represented by use of the icon image and when a use interacts (clicks) on

Art Unit: 2142

the icon image (see Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-49), it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Yahoo! with what is taught by Wolff as outlined above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination due to being from the same field of endeavor (client-server network systems) and for the reasons stated above, particularly teaching the use of displaying images to user that are deemed clickable by Wolff and Yahoo! for teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event and the use of different images to be displayed to a user is deemed an obvious variation in the art. In view of Wolff, the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28).

13. Regarding claim 19, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the modifying a standard company logo includes creating the special event logo by modifying the standard company logo with one or more animated images (Yahoo!).

14. Regarding claims 21, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the special event includes a holiday (Yahoo!).

Art Unit: 2142

15. Regarding claim 22, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the processor further configured to:

associating one or more search terms relating to the special event with the special event logo (Wolff, col. 8, ll. 42-46, it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way.); and

wherein invoking a search includes:

performing the search based on the one or more search terms (Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-47).

16.

17. Regarding claim 23, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the uploading the special event includes displaying the special event logo on the web page during the special event (Yahoo! displayed the altered logo during the holiday season.).

18. Regarding claim 24, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the invoking a search includes:

generating a search query using the one or more search terms (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13);

using the search query to search at least one of a network, an index, or a directory (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13); and

obtaining search results based on the search (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 9-13).

19. Regarding claim 25, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the modifying a standard company logo includes:

determining a home page for the web page on a network (Yahoo!,
<http://www.yahoo.com>);

identifying the standard company logo on the home page (Yahoo!, standard Yahoo! logo); and

modifying the standard company logo with special event information to create the special event logo (Yahoo!, the addition of the reindeer to the standard logo creates a modified logo).

20. Regarding claim 26, Wolff teaches a method for enticing users to access a web page comprising the use of a graphical icon image (i.e. an advertisement banner) wherein the icon image is uploaded for display to a user on a web page. A keyword (search term) (indicia) is associated with the icon image wherein when the user selects the icon image a search is invoked to search an online database and then the search results are presented to the user on a web page (see Wolff, column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 15). The search results are then returned to the user in the form of a web page (col. 9, ll. 9-13). Wolff does not explicitly teach that the graphical icon image is a standard company logo that can be modified to become a special event logo. However, in related art, Yahoo! teaches wherein a company logo can be modified to commemorate a special event (see Yahoo!). Wolff provides an environment wherein different icon images can be displayed to a user on a web page and therefore it is

Art Unit: 2142

deemed an obvious variation to present to a user an altered image. Yahoo! demonstrates this functionality wherein Yahoo! has altered their own company logo to celebrate the Christmas season. Wolff teaches that is known in the prior art to use different types of images for seasonal and one time use (column 2, ll. 27-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the teachings of Wolff wherein the ability to display clickable images to a user on a web page in combination with the functionalities of Yahoo! wherein it is taught that one of ordinary skill can alter an image and upload it for display to a user on a web page. Further, it would have been obvious to associate the "search term" to relate to the graphical icon image as taught by Wolff because the keyword associated with the icon image is supposed to directly identify the product or service being represented by use of the icon image and when a user interacts (clicks) on the icon image (see Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-49), it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Yahoo! with what is taught by Wolff as outlined above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination due to being from the same field of endeavor (client-server network systems) and for the reasons stated above,

particularly teaching the use of displaying images to user that are deemed clickable by Wolff and Yahoo! for teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event and the use of different images to be displayed to a user is deemed an obvious variation in the art. In view of Wolff, the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28).

21. Regarding claim 27, Wolff teaches a method for enticing users to access a web page comprising the use of a graphical icon image (i.e. an advertisement banner) wherein the icon image is uploaded for display to a user on a web page. A keyword (search term) (indicia) is associated with the icon image wherein when the user selects the icon image a search is invoked to search an online database and then the search results are presented to the user on a web page (see Wolff, column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 15). Wolff does not explicitly teach that the graphical icon image is a standard company logo that can be modified to become a special event logo. However, in related art, Yahoo! teaches wherein a company logo can be modified to commemorate a special event (see Yahoo!). Wolff provides an environment wherein different icon images can be displayed to a user on a web page and therefore it is deemed an obvious variation to present to a user an altered image. Yahoo! demonstrates this functionality wherein Yahoo! has altered their own company logo to celebrate the Christmas season. Wolff teaches that is known in the prior art to use different types of images for seasonal and one time use (column 2, ll. 27-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the teachings of Wolff wherein the ability to

Art Unit: 2142

display clickable images to a user on a web page in combination with the functionalities of Yahoo! wherein it is taught that one of ordinary skill can alter an image and upload it for display to a user on a web page. Further, it would have been obvious to associate the "search term" to relate to the graphical icon image as taught by Wolff because the keyword associated with the icon image is supposed to directly identify the product or service being represented by use of the icon image and when a user interacts (clicks) on the icon image (see Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-49), it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way. Yahoo! clearly teaches the uploading of an image to a web page in this case the uploading has been done to the home page as indicated (www.yahoo.com) and the altered image is actually being displayed where the standard company logo is customarily presented. By way of actually uploading the image to the home page by Yahoo! then it is taught by Yahoo! the functionality of home page determination. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Yahoo! with what is taught by Wolff as outlined above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination due to being from the same field of endeavor (client-server network systems) and for the reasons stated above, particularly teaching the use of displaying

images to user that are deemed clickable by Wolff and Yahoo! for teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event and the use of different images to be displayed to a user is deemed an obvious variation in the art. In view of Wolff, the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28).

22. Regarding claim 28, Wolff teaches a method for enticing users to access a web page comprising the use of a graphical icon image (i.e. an advertisement banner) wherein the icon image is uploaded for display to a user on a web page. A keyword (search term) (indicia) is associated with the icon image wherein when the user selects the icon image a search is invoked to search an online database and then the search results are presented to the user on a web page (see Wolff, column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 15). Wolff does not explicitly teach that the graphical icon image is a standard company logo that can be modified to become a special event logo. However, in related art, Yahoo! teaches wherein a company logo can be modified to commemorate a special event (see Yahoo!). Wolff provides an environment wherein different icon images can be displayed to a user on a web page and therefore it is deemed an obvious variation to present to a user an altered image. Yahoo! demonstrates this functionality wherein Yahoo! has altered their own company logo to celebrate the Christmas season. Wolff teaches that is known in the prior art to use different types of images for seasonal and one time use (column 2, ll. 27-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the teachings of Wolff wherein the ability to

Art Unit: 2142

display clickable images to a user on a web page in combination with the functionalities of Yahoo! wherein it is taught that one of ordinary skill can alter an image and upload it for display to a user on a web page. Further, it would have been obvious to associate the "search term" to relate to the graphical icon image as taught by Wolff because the keyword associated with the icon image is supposed to directly identify the product or service being represented by use of the icon image and when a user interacts (clicks) on the icon image (see Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-49), it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Yahoo! with what is taught by Wolff as outlined above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination due to being from the same field of endeavor (client-server network systems) and for the reasons stated above, particularly teaching the use of displaying images to user that are deemed clickable by Wolff and Yahoo! for teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event and the use of different images to be displayed to a user is deemed an obvious variation in the art. In view of Wolff, the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art

wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28).

23. Regarding claim 29, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the modifying a standard company logo includes creating the special event logo by modifying the standard company logo with one or more animated images (Yahoo!).

24. Regarding claim 31, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the medium includes instructions for modifying the standard company logo with information associated with a holiday (Yahoo!).

25. Regarding claim 32, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the processor further configured to:
associate one or more search terms relating to the special event with the special event logo (Wolff, col. 8, ll. 42-46, it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way.).

26. Regarding claim 33, Wolff and Yahoo! teach wherein the processor is further configured to:

detect a selection associated with the special event logo (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13);

generate a search query based on the one or more search terms (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13);

perform a search based on the search query (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13); and
provide a result of the search (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13).

27. Regarding claim 34, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein uploading the special event logo includes replacing the standard company logo with the special event logo on the web page (Yahoo!, page is from 12/23/1996).

28. Regarding claim 35, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the medium wherein the instructions for uploading the special event logo include:

instructions for replacing the standard company logo with the special event logo on the web page (Yahoo!, page is from 12/23/1996).

29. Regarding claim 36, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method further comprising:

replacing the standard company logo with the special event logo (Yahoo!, page is from 12/23/1996).

30. Regarding claim 37, Wolff teaches a method for enticing users to access a web page comprising the use of a graphical icon image (i.e. an advertisement banner) wherein the icon image is uploaded for display to a user on a web page. A keyword (search term) (indicia) is associated with the icon image wherein when the user selects the icon image a search is invoked to search an online database and then the search results are presented to the user on a web page (see Wolff, column 8, line 56 - column 9, line 15). Wolff does not explicitly teach that the graphical icon image is a standard company logo that can be modified to become a special event logo. However, in related art, Yahoo! teaches wherein a company logo can be modified to commemorate a special event (see Yahoo!). Wolff provides an environment wherein different icon

Art Unit: 2142

images can be displayed to a user on a web page and therefore it is deemed an obvious variation to present to a user an altered image. Yahoo! demonstrates this functionality wherein Yahoo! has altered their own company logo to celebrate the Christmas season. Wolff teaches that is known in the prior art to use different types of images for seasonal and one time use (column 2, ll. 27-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to enable the teachings of Wolff wherein the ability to display clickable images to a user on a web page in combination with the functionalities of Yahoo! wherein it is taught that one of ordinary skill can alter an image and upload it for display to a user on a web page. Further, it would have been obvious to associate the "search term" to relate to the graphical icon image as taught by Wolff because the keyword associated with the icon image is supposed to directly identify the product or service being represented by use of the icon image and when a user interacts (clicks) on the icon image (see Wolff, col. 8, ll. 43-49), it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Yahoo! with what is taught by Wolff as outlined above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination due to being from the same field of endeavor (client-server network

Art Unit: 2142

systems) and for the reasons stated above, particularly teaching the use of displaying images to user that are deemed clickable by Wolff and Yahoo! for teaching the use of altered images which may commemorate a special event and the use of different images to be displayed to a user is deemed an obvious variation in the art. In view of Wolff, the use of different images is clearly taught as a motivation in the prior art wherein one of ordinary skill in the art may find it useful to use different image types for seasonal use (col. 2, ll. 27-28).

31. Regarding claim 38, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein one or more search terms are associated with the special event logo (Wolff, col. 8, ll. 42-46, it is deemed obvious that search results should be directly related to whatever the icon represents instead of erroneous data. One of ordinary skill would not find it desirable to provide search results that are totally unrelated to what is being displayed by the icon image. Therefore, in view of Yahoo!, if an image is altered in some sort of way, the keyword associated with the image should be changed accordingly so that the keyword corresponds to the image in some sort of way.); and

wherein the invoking a search relating to the special event includes:

causing a search to be performed based on the one or more search terms (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-13).

32. Regarding claim 39, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein the presenting a special event logo includes:

displaying the special event logo on the web page during the special event (Yahoo! image was displayed over the holiday season).

Art Unit: 2142

33. Regarding claim 40, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein invoking a search includes:

invoking a search of the Internet (col. 9, ll. 3-7).

34. Regarding claim 41, Wolff and Yahoo! teach the method wherein invoking a search includes:

invoking a search for web pages relating to the special event (Wolff, col. 9, ll. 3-7, a search is invoked of online content.).

35. Claims 20 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff, Yahoo! and what was well known at the time of the applicant's invention.

36. Regarding claim 20, official notice is taken that the use of video or audio data to be displayed to a user on a web page was old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include video or audio data in the special event logo because one of ordinary skill would have recognized the advancement of using different types of media to catch the interest of the user viewing a page.

37. Regarding claim 30, official notice is taken that the use of video or audio data to be displayed to a user on a web page was old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to include video or audio data in the special event logo because one of ordinary skill would have recognized the advancement of using different types of media to catch the interest of the user viewing a page.

Conclusion

38. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lawrence et al. (US 6,999,959 B1) teach a meta search engine.

Miloslavsky et al. (US 6,879,586 B2) teach internet protocol call-in centers and establishing remote agents.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa

Beatriz Prieto
BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER